



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Approved by OMB  
3060-1122  
Expires: March 31, 2018  
Estimated time per response: 10-55  
hours

Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122 , the FCC’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

**A. Filing Information**

**1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

State or Jurisdiction
Texas <sup>1 2</sup>

**2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

Name	Title	Organization
Patrick Tyler	General Counsel	Commission on State Emergency Communications

<sup>1</sup> 9-1-1 service in Texas is provided via the state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC and implemented through 23 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), and by 52 Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs) as defined in Texas Health and Safety Code § 771.001(3)(A) and (B). There are two types of ECDs—statutory ECDs established under Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 772 (772 ECDs); and public agency ECDs created and operated under local ordinances (municipal ECDs). The state 9-1-1 program provides 9-1-1 service in 214 of Texas’ 254 counties, covering approximately two-thirds of the geography and one-fourth of the state’s population. Twenty-five statutory 772 ECDs provide 9-1-1 service to approximately 62% of the population of Texas. Twenty-seven municipal ECDs (including one county ECD) provide 9-1-1 service primarily in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

<sup>2</sup> Texas’ response includes the information from all RPCs and 772 ECDs and all but three municipal ECDS. The municipal ECDs not providing information constitute approximately 0.35% of Texas’ population.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

1. Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2015:

PSAP Type <sup>3</sup>	Total
Primary	490
Secondary	64
<b>Total</b>	<b>554</b>

2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>4</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2015:

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total <sup>5</sup>
Full-Time	880
Part-time	19

<sup>3</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), July 29, 2014, at 118, 126, available at [https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014\\_2014072.pdf](https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See *Master Glossary* at 137.

<sup>5</sup> The uses of 9-1-1 fees (including the statewide equalization surcharge) to fund telecommunicators varies based on the jurisdiction's interpretation of applicable statutes and local ordinances.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

<b>Amount</b> (\$)	\$232,792,528.78 <sup>6</sup>
-----------------------	-------------------------------

**3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

**4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015.**

Type of Service <sup>7</sup>	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	2,980,196
Wireless	24,917,198
VoIP	878,125
Other <sup>8</sup>	229,581

<sup>6</sup> Amount equals total 772 ECD wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless revenues collected; for the state 9-1-1 program appropriated wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless and (9-1-1 only) equalization surcharge, and for the municipal ECDs a total cost estimate.

<sup>7</sup> The number of 9-1-1 calls reported for each Type of Service is based on the National Emergency Number Association's "class of service" or "CoS" codes assigned to each call. Additionally, some municipal ECDs do not track 9-1-1 calls by type of service, *e.g.*, VoIP and other calls may be included in wireline and wireless call numbers. CoS itself, however, may not accurately reflect the type of call. For example, whether a 9-1-1 call is displayed with a CoS of "wireline" or "VoIP" may depend on whether the service provider, including a VoIP cable telco, has loaded a record containing relevant information including Automatic Location Information (ALI) into the traditional legacy ALI database, or whether the service provider utilizes a pANI, dynamically populated record approach provided by a VoIP Positioning Center. The same is also the case regarding Multi-Line Telephone System 9-1-1 calls as well.

<sup>8</sup> Includes reported Multi-Line Telephone System, telematics, and text-to-911 calls.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

<b>Total</b>	29,005,100
--------------	------------

**C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**

**1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? *Check one.***

- Yes .....
- No .....

**1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.**

Wireline 9-1-1 fees: Texas Health and Safety Code Ann. §§ 771.071, 772.114, 772.214, 772.314, 772.403, 772.516 and via municipal ordinances. Municipal ordinances setting the amount of the wireline fee pursuant to Home-Rule City constitutional authority<sup>9</sup>

Statewide Wireless/Prepaid Wireless 9-1-1 Fees: Texas Health and Safety Code Ann. §§ 771.0711, 771.0712.

Statewide Equalization Surcharge: Texas Health and Safety Code Ann. § 771.072.

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

No.

<sup>9</sup> Tex. Local Gov. Code, Chapter 102 (city budgets); Tex. Local Gov. Code, Chapter 111 (county budgets). *See also e.g.,* City of University Park Code of Ordinance 1.1102; City of Lancaster Ordinance, Chapter 1, Article 1.400, Sec. 1.402; City of Hutchins, Ordinance No. 692, Sec. 1., Art. 11.801.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? Check one.**

- The State collects the fees .....
- A Local Authority collects the fees .....
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies  
(e.g., state and local authority) collect the fees .....

**3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

9-1-1 service in Texas is provided via the state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC and implemented through 23 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), and by 25 statutory 772 ECDs and 27 public agency (municipal) ECDs. (772 refers to the Health and Safety Code Chapter under which statutory ECDs are created.)

Funding of the state 9-1-1 program is provided for by the Texas Legislature via a biennial appropriation to CSEC from collected wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, and equalization surcharge fees remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into dedicated accounts. Funds in the dedicated accounts may be appropriated to CSEC only for “planning, development, provision, or enhancement of the effectiveness of 9-1-1 service or for contracts with [RPCs] for 9-1-1 service.”<sup>10</sup> More specifically, appropriated wireline fees are allocated by CSEC to RPCs “for use in providing 9-1-1 services as provided by contracts executed under Section 771.078.”<sup>11</sup> Per state law, wireless 9-1-1 fees “may be used only for services related to 9-1-1 service;”<sup>12</sup> and with respect to the state 9-1-1 program, may be appropriated “only for planning, development, provision, or enhancement of the effectiveness of 9-1-1 service or for contracts with [RPCs].”<sup>13</sup> In 2013 the Texas Legislature amended Health and Safety Code § 771.079 to authorize the Legislature to appropriate 9-1-1 fees to “provide assistance to volunteer fire departments” but only if 9-1-1 service is fully funded and all other sources of revenue dedicated to assisting volunteer fire departments are obligated for the fiscal period. To date, no 9-1-1 fees have been appropriated to volunteer fire departments. The RPCs pay 9-1-1 service expenses directly to service providers and make grant funds available through Interlocal Agreements to public agencies within each RPC’s region to provide 9-1-1 service.

Equalization surcharge revenue is appropriated to CSEC by the Texas Legislature and allocated by CSEC to “fund approved plans of regional planning commissions and regional poison control

<sup>10</sup> Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 771.079(c).

<sup>11</sup> § 771.071(f).

<sup>12</sup> § 771.0711(c).

<sup>13</sup> § 771.079(c).



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

centers [under § 777.009]<sup>14</sup> and to carry out its duties under this chapter.” There are six regional poison control centers (RPCCs) that comprise the Texas Poison Control Network.<sup>15</sup> CSEC administers the poison control program in a manner similar to that of the state 9-1-1 program by providing grants to fund CSEC approved strategic plans of the RPCCs. Surcharge may also be appropriated to fund the state emergency medical dispatch program;<sup>16</sup> “fund county and regional emergency medical services, designated trauma facilities, and trauma care systems;”<sup>17</sup> and “to fund the [NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical services] pilot project.”<sup>18</sup>

ECDs impose, collect and use wireline 9-1-1 fees at the regional level in accordance with Health and Safety Code Chapter 772 or via their local public agency governing bodies and municipal ordinances. Wireline 9-1-1 fees collected within the areas of 772 ECDs are accounted for in the ECDs’ annual budget and may be expended only for 9-1-1 purposes as expressly provided by Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 772.<sup>19</sup> The use of wireline 9-1-1 fees collected by Municipal ECDs is prescribed by applicable laws or ordinances for expending funds in accordance with city and county budgets.<sup>20</sup> ECD wireless and prepaid wireless fees are collected at the state level and distributed by CSEC on a monthly basis to each ECD based on the ratio of each ECD’s population to the population of the state.<sup>21</sup> ECDs use their proportion of wireless and prepaid wireless fees for their participating jurisdictions in the same manner as they do so with their wireline 9-1-1 fees. Per state law, wireless 9-1-1 fees “may be used only for services related to 9-1-1 service.”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>14</sup> CSEC administers the Texas Poison Control Program via approved strategic plans and grants to six host medical institutions.

<sup>15</sup> Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 771.072(f).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at § 771.106.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at § 771.072(g) (quotation from § 773.122 regarding Emergency Medical Services).

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at § 771.156.

<sup>19</sup> §§ 772.114, 772.214, 772.314, and 772.516; Texas Att’y Gen Op. No. JC-410.

<sup>20</sup> Tex. Local Gov. Code, Chapter 102 (city budgets); Tex. Local Gov. Code, Chapter 111 (county budgets). *See also e.g.*, City of University Park Code of Ordinance 1.1102; City of Lancaster Ordinance, Chapter 1, Article 1.400, Sec. 1.402; City of Hutchins, Ordinance No. 692, Sec. 1., Art. 11.801.

<sup>21</sup> Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 771.0711(c).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**D. Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

<b>1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.</b>		
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds (Check one)</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)</b>		
<p>For the state 9-1-1 program, CSEC approves RPC biennial strategic plans detailing how 9-1-1 service will be provided, and allocated 9-1-1 fees and surcharge will be used, throughout the RPC's region. CSEC's authority over the use of 9-1-1 fees and surcharge is limited by statute.</p> <p>The authority of CSEC and the state's 75 Texas 9-1-1 Entities is limited to each's 9-1-1 service jurisdictional boundaries. CSEC's jurisdiction regarding the equalization surcharge is statewide.</p> <p>The use of wireline 9-1-1 fees is determined by either statute (Health and Safety Code Chapters 771 and 772) or municipal ordinance. Wireline 9-1-1 fees are set by CSEC for the state 9-1-1 program and individually by ECDs, but per statute the fee may only be imposed on local exchange access lines or their equivalent as defined by CSEC rule.</p> <p>The statewide wireless/prepaid wireless fees and the equalization surcharge are established in statute. Limitations on the use thereof by any Texas 9-1-1 Entity is also determined by the Legislature.</p>		

**2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one.***

- Yes .....
- No .....



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.**

The use of appropriated wireline 9-1-1 fees for the state 9-1-1 program is determined by statute (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.071, 771.075, 771.0751, 771.079); for statutory 772 ECDs use is determined by statute (Health and Safety Code Chapter 772); and for municipal ECDs by city/county ordinance. Wireline 9-1-1 fees are set by CSEC for the state program (capped by the Texas Legislature at \$0.50). Each 772 ECD annually sets its wireline fee as part of annual budgeting (capped at a maximum percentage of the base rate charges for local exchange access lines and with a 100 line limitation at a single location served by a service provider). Municipal ECDs are set by each ECD for its service area. By law wireline 9-1-1 fees may only be imposed on “local exchange access lines” or “equivalent local exchange access lines” as defined by CSEC rule.

The statewide wireless/prepaid wireless fees and equalization surcharge are established in statute. Limitations on the use thereof is determined by the Legislature (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.0711(c), 771.072(d)-(e), 771.075, 771.0751, 771.079(c), 771.156(a).)

**2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.**

[Empty box for response to 2b]

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

**1. Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

**State Administered Activities, Programs, and Organizations:**

**Activities**  
STATEWIDE 9-1-1 SERVICE: Planning, developing, provisioning, and/or enhancement of 9-1-1 service.  
POISON CONTROL SERVICES: Maintain high quality telephone poison referral and related service, including community programs and assistance, in Texas.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**9-1-1 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION:** Provide for the timely and cost effective coordination and support of statewide 9-1-1 service by CSEC, including regulatory proceedings, contract management and monitoring, and requirements contained in Health and Safety Code § 771.051.

**POISON PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:** Provide for the timely and cost effective coordination and support by CSEC of the Texas Poison Control Network and service providers, including monitoring, administration of the telecommunications network operations, and the operations of Texas' six regional poison control call centers. Funded on a reimbursement basis solely out of collected equalization surcharge.

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH:** Support the regional emergency medical dispatch resource center program.

**TRAUMA CARE SYSTEM:** Support the emergent, unexpected needs of approved licensed providers of emergency medical services (EMS), registered first responder organizations, or licensed hospitals.

**NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 TELEMEDICINE MEDICAL SERVICES PILOT PROJECT:** Effective September 1, 2015, a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 – 771.160.)

**Programs**

**9-1-1 NETWORK OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT AND NG 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION:** CSEC contracts with Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) or on their behalf for the efficient operation of the state 9-1-1 emergency telecommunications system; provides the RPCs with contract authorization and funding for the replacement of equipment supporting Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) participating in the state's 9-1-1 program; and provides for the planning, development, transition and implementation of a statewide Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service.

*This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing the network, equipment, database and administration necessary to provide 9-1-1 telecommunications service.*

**NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION:** CSEC provides for the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service. Functional activities include implementation of 1) a CSEC State-level digital 9-1-1 network, otherwise referred to as the emergency services internet protocol network (ESInet); 2) 9-1-1 geospatial database and data management; 3) NG9-1-1 applications and network security provisions; and, 5) standards-based system operations and procedures.

*This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing a planned transition to NG9-1-1 to ensure existing 9-1-1 centers and public safety providers are able to provide emergency communications and service to the public with advances in communications devices and systems.*



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

REGIONAL POISON CONTROL CENTER OPERATIONS AND TEXAS POISON CONTROL NETWORK

**OPERATIONS:** CSEC contracts with six RPCCs to provide poison control services and to assist in maintaining the Texas Poison Control Network. Citizens calling 1-800-222-1222, or a 9-1-1 call transferred from a PSAP, receive medical information to treat a possible poison or drug interaction before medical services are required to be dispatched. CSEC also contracts and funds the telecommunications services necessary to operate and maintain the poison control telecommunications network, including network, equipment and software to facilitate call delivery and treatment.

*This program supports an enhancement to 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety by providing the network, equipment, databases, administration and staffing to provide poison control service to the public, first responders and health care facilities.*

**REGIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH RESOURCE CENTER:** The purpose of this program is to serve as a resource to provide pre-arrival instructions that may be accessed by selected public safety answering points that are not adequately staffed or funded to provide those services. (Health and Safety Code § 771.102.) PSAPs subscribe to emergency medical dispatch services provided by the resource center.

*This program supports 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety with a resource for pre-arrival instructions when 9-1-1 calls originate from persons in remote or inaccessible areas to which the dispatch of emergency service providers may be difficult or take a long period of time.*

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AND TRAUMA CARE SYSTEMS:** The purpose of the emergency medical services and trauma care system is to provide for the prompt and efficient transportation of sick and injured patients, after stabilization, and to encourage public access to that transportation in each area of the state. Equalization surcharge is used to fund the system, in connection with an effort to provide coordination with the appropriate trauma service area, the cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and communications systems for local emergency medical services. (Texas Health & Safety Code § 773.112 (a) – (c).)

*This program supports an enhancement to 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety by enhancing the communications systems and response of local emergency medical service responders.*

**NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 TELEMEDICINE MEDICAL SERVICES PILOT PROJECT:** Effective September 1, 2015, a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 – 771.160.)

**Organizations**

**COMMISSION ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (CSEC):** Established as a state agency under Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 771, CSEC is the state's authority on emergency communications and administers the state 9-1-1 program in which 9-1-1 service is provided by 23 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs). CSEC is directly involved in the RPCs' provisioning of 9-1-



## Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

1 service and in the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system.

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS:** Established under Texas Local Government Code, Chapter 391. Political subdivisions with whom CSEC is required to contract for the provision of 9-1-1 service. RPCs purchase goods and services that provision 9-1-1 service to PSAPs with state appropriated funds that are granted by CSEC.

**REGIONAL POISON CONTROL CENTERS:** Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 777 designates six regional centers for poison control in Texas. RPCCs provide 24-hour toll-free referral and information service for the public and health care professionals and provide community programs and assistance on poison prevention. Each PSAP in the state of Texas is required to have direct access to at least one poison center.

**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MEDICAL BRANCH - GALVESTON:** Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated to the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (UTMB-Galveston) to partly fund the emergency medical dispatch program. (Texas Health and Safety Code § 771.106.) Funds are appropriated by the Texas Legislature directly to UTMB-Galveston, which in turn contracts with the Montgomery County Hospital District to operate and maintain the emergency medical dispatch resource center that provides services, on a subscription basis, to PSAPs in Texas. (Effective September, 1, 2015, the Commission, rather than UTMB-Galveston, serves as the administrator of the emergency medical dispatch program.)

**BUREAU OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF STATE HEALTH SERVICES:** Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated by the Texas Legislature directly to the Texas Department of State Health Services, and authorized to be used for the provision and coordination regional trauma services, which may include the cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and communications systems for local emergency medical services. (Texas Health and Safety Code § 773.112 (a) – (c).)

**TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER:** Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated to CSEC to provide a grant to Texas Tech University Health Science Center (TTUHSC) to fund a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. \$250,000 for both fiscal years 2016 and 2017 have been appropriated for the pilot project. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 – 771.160.)

**STATUTORY 772 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS:** The 772 ECD expenditures include ongoing contracts or expenses for Selective Routing, Automatic Location Identification, Customer Premises Equipment, Geographic Information Systems and Mapping, NG9-1-1 transition migration, IP and/or wireless networks, security, legal, regulatory, advocacy, accounting, auditing, emergency notification, training, employer/employee related amounts, and memberships or conferences that support 9-1-1 services and/or enhancements and sponsored by organizations such as the National



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Emergency Number Association, the Texas Emergency Number Association, and the ATIS Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ESIF).

**MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS (INCL. DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE):**

Municipal ECD expenditures are substantially used to purchase, install, maintain 9-1-1 equipment; and staff and operate PSAPs, including personnel salaries, training of call-takers, dues and subscriptions to professional organizations which enhance the development of 9-1-1 service. Additionally, 9-1-1 funds are used to pay for 9-1-1 network and 9-1-1 database maintenance costs, and reimbursing service providers costs incurred in providing 9-1-1 service. Funds are also used for location services, public education, emergency warning sirens/systems, emergency medical dispatch training and certification, and general support of a Municipal ECDs 9-1-1 division. 9-1-1 funds are often only a minor part of the funding needed to provide 9-1-1 service or operate an emergency communications center.

**2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply.<sup>23</sup>**

Type of Cost		Yes	No
<b>Operating Costs</b>	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	Telecommunicators’ Salaries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>23</sup> “Yes” and “No” answers to a given line item reflect different uses of 9-1-1 fees; different interpretation and application of state law regarding the use of wireless/prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fees; and different interpretation as to the classification of a cost (e.g., operating cost as opposed to an administrative cost).



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

<b>Administrative Costs</b>	Program Administration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Dispatch Costs</b>	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Grant Programs</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>If YES, see 2a.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.**

The state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 23 RPCs for the specific purpose of providing 9-1-1 service in each RPC's region. CSEC provides grants of appropriated surcharge revenues to six Regional Poison Control Center host hospitals to partially fund the state Poison Control Program. (Equalization surcharge revenue is also appropriated to UTMB-Galveston, the Department of State Health Services, and TTUHSC to fund emergency medical dispatch services, county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, and a telemedicine medical services pilot program, respectively.)



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

<b>1. Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.</b>		
<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Fee/Charge Imposed</b>	<b>Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination)</b>
Wireline	<p><u>State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC):</u> The wireline fee is set by CSEC at \$0.50 per access line/per month (the rate is capped by statute at \$0.50).</p> <p><u>ECDs:</u> Res: \$0.20 - \$1.44 per local exchange access line/month. Bus: \$0.46 - \$5.40 per access line/month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas. Bus. Trunk: \$0.74 to \$5.40.</p>	<p>In the state 9-1-1 program area (CSEC/RPCs), wireline fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into a general revenue dedicated account (GRD). Funds in the GRD are appropriated by the Texas Legislature to CSEC on a biennial basis to fund 9-1-1 service in the state 9-1-1 program.</p> <p>In ECD (statutory and municipal) service areas, wireline fees are set by each ECD; and collected and remitted directly to the ECD.</p>
Wireless	State wireless 9-1-1 fee: \$0.50 per month per wireless telecommunications connection.	<p>The statewide wireless and prepaid wireless fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller.</p> <p>On a monthly basis, CSEC distributes to each ECD its proportional share of remitted wireless/prepaid wireless revenues based on population. The remaining funds (<i>i.e.</i>, attributable to RPC areas) are deposited into the GRD account</p>
Prepaid Wireless	State prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fee: 2% of the purchase price of each prepaid wireless	



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

	telecommunications service	referenced above and use to fund RPC strategic plans.
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	Wireline rates applicable.	See answer above regarding Wireline.
Other	State equalization surcharge: \$0.06/month per local exchange access line access line or wireless telecommunications connection (excluding connections that constitute prepaid wireless telecommunications service).	The statewide equalization surcharge is collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller and placed into its own GRD account. Out of the account, the Texas Legislature appropriates to CSEC the amounts deemed necessary to fund 9-1-1 service in those areas in which wireline/wireless fee revenue is insufficient to provide a specific level of 9-1-1 service; and for other 9-1-1 related programs (e.g., emergency medical dispatch) and the Texas Poison Control Program

**2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

Service Type <sup>24</sup>	Total Amount Collected (\$)
Wireline	\$69,900,837
Wireless	\$108,963,296
Prepaid Wireless	\$24,885,131
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	Amount included in Wireline collections above

<sup>24</sup> Amounts reflect actual collections for ECDs and for the state 9-1-1 program. Total amounts collected and the estimate of total costs to provide 9-1-1 service (Question B.3.) differ primarily because the state 9-1-1 program was appropriated more funds than were collected during calendar year 2015.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Other (State Equalization Surcharge)	\$19,189,471 <sup>25</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$222,938,735</b>

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

**3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

Some municipal ECDs may use local general revenue as a source of funding for 911/E911 or costs related to or closely associated with 911/E911, as may local governing bodies in areas served by RPCs and 772 ECDs.

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? Check one.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> For Calendar Year 2014 the amount provided for the state equalization surcharge was \$7,320,000—equal to the amount of surcharge appropriated to CSEC. For Calendar Year 2015 the amount reflects total surcharge collected, irrespective of the amount of surcharge appropriated to CSEC.

<sup>26</sup> Whether a Texas 9-1-1 Entity combined other funds (federal, state, local) with 911/E911 fees to support 9-1-1 service depends on the Entity’s determination of what costs are attributable to 9-1-1 service. By way of example, the City of Dallas reported that it spent \$14.6 million in general funds for call taking and dispatch support for police and fire. A majority of Texas 9-1-1 Entities, however, do not include the costs of call taking and dispatch as part of 9-1-1 service. Accordingly, Texas answered “No,” to reflect the majority view.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.**

--

<b>5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.<sup>27</sup></b>	<b>Percent</b>
State 911 Fees <sup>28</sup>	71.64%
Local 911 Fees <sup>29</sup>	28.36%
General Fund - State	
General Fund - County	
Federal Grants	
State Grants	

<sup>27</sup> Percentages of total cost to support 9-1-1 are derived from 9-1-1 fee and equalization surcharge revenues.

<sup>28</sup> State 9-1-1 fees for the purpose of this response consist of appropriated wireline, wireless/prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fee revenues for the state 9-1-1 program and equalization surcharge, and actual wireless/prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fee revenues of the ECDs during CY 2015.

<sup>29</sup> Local 9-1-1 fees for the purpose of this response consists only of ECD wireline 9-1-1 fee revenue—which is remitted by service providers directly to each ECD directly.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**G. Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

Question	Yes	No
<b>1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2015, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism? <i>Check one.</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.</b>		
<b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>	<b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i></b>	

**H. Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

Question	Yes	No
<b>1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? <i>Check one.</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2015. <i>(Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</i></b>		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

For the state 9-1-1 program, 9-1-1 service is provided by 23 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) and overseen and administered by CSEC. Health and Safety Code Chapter 771 governs the state 9-1-1 program and includes requirements for providing 9-1-1 service and prescribes limits regarding the use of 9-1-1 fees and the equalization surcharge. CSEC rules and policy statements are used to implement 9-1-1 service consistent with statutory requirements. Per these rules/policies, CSEC routinely monitors RPC expenditures of appropriated and allocated 9-1-1 service fees and equalization surcharge for uses consistency with statute. CSEC, in turn, is subject to audit by the Texas State Auditor, Texas Comptroller (*e.g.*, post payment audits), as well as by its internal auditor.

The 772 ECDs are statutorily charged to provide for 9-1-1 service in their participating jurisdiction areas. In addition, the 772 ECDs are required to submit a draft annual budget to their participating jurisdictions for 9-1-1 service, and adopt the final annual budget at an open public meeting. As soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, the director of the ECD will prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year. The report must show in detail the operations of the ECD for the period covered by the report. The board of managers of the ECD is required to perform an annual independent financial audit.

As noted earlier, municipal ECDs and the one county ECD are required by state law to set annual budgets at open public meetings and perform audits. As also noted, however, 9-1-1 fees represent a fraction of the overall budgeting and auditing responsibilities of these governing bodies.

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers? <i>Check one.</i></b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2015. (<i>Enter “None” if no actions were taken.</i>)</b></p>		
<p>The Texas Comptroller is authorized to audit any service provider that has been set-up at the state level to remit 9-1-1 fees and/or the equalization surcharge to the Comptroller; including retailers of prepaid wireless telecommunications service. The Comptroller has exclusive jurisdiction over the statewide wireless/prepaid wireless and equalization surcharge fees, and regularly conducts (multi-year) audits of service providers. These audits, while typically initiated for sales tax and other purposes, will generally audit all taxes the provider is set-up to remit—including 9-1-1 fees and the equalization surcharge. CSEC lacks information regarding specific audits initiated by the Texas Comptroller during calendar year 2015.</p>		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The board of managers of a statutory ECD may require a service provider to provide to the board any information the board requires (so long as the information and the format requested are readily available) to determine whether the service provider is correctly billing, collecting, and remitting the ECD's wireline/VoIP 9-1-1 fee. The information required from a service provider may include:

- (1) the number of local exchange access lines that the service provider has in the district; and
- (2) the number of those local exchange access lines that CSEC has excluded from the definition of a local exchange access line or an equivalent local exchange access line under Health and Safety Code § 771.063.

A statutory ECD may bring suit to enforce or collect its wireline/VoIP 9-1-1 fee. In a proceeding to collect unremitted fees, a sworn affidavit of the ECD specifying the amount of unremitted fees is prima facie evidence that the fees were not remitted and of the amount of the unremitted fees.

Municipal ECDs as Home-Rule Cities generally have broad authority to do what they deem necessary unless such is expressly in conflict with state law. The one county ECD lacks similar inherent authority, and may have more limited options if similar issues were not being mutually pursued with either the Texas Comptroller and/or the statutory ECDs and other municipal ECDs.

**I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes? Check one.</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:</b></p>		
<p>Health and Safety Code §§ 771.0512, 771.0711, 771.0712, 771.072, 771.075, 771.0751, and 771.079. (The foregoing provisions applicable to the use of state wireless/prepaid wireless fees and the state equalization surcharge are apply throughout the state—including in areas in which 9-1-1 service is provided by an ECD.)</p> <p>For statutory 772 ECDs, “allowable operating expenses include all costs attributable to designing a 9-1-1 system and all equipment and personnel necessary to establish and operate a public safety answering point and other related operations that the board considers necessary.” Cf., Health and Safety Code §§ 772.117, 772.217, 772.317, and 772.519. Two of the 25 statutory ECDs are expressly instructed to</p>		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

provide 9-1-1 service to their participating jurisdictions through “equivalent state-of-the-art technology.” Cf. Health and Safety Code §§ 772.110 and 772.512.

Municipal ECDs generally have broad authority as home-rule cities or as a county to classify expenditures unless such are expressly in conflict with state law.

Question	Yes	No
<b>2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2015, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? Check one.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.</b>		
<b>Amount (\$)</b>	For the 2015 calendar year, the amounts expended on NG9-1-1 are as follows:  <u>State 9-1-1 Program:</u> A total of \$11,063,244 in 9-1-1 funding was spent by the State 9-1-1 program on activities related to the implementation of NG9-1-1 ESInets. The CSEC spent a total of \$ 7,041,464 in 9-1-1 funds on activities related to the implementation of its State-level ESInet. 17 RPCs spent a total of \$4,021,780 in allocated 9-1-1 funds on activities related to implementation of Regional ESInets.  <u>772 ECDs:</u> \$16,791,803.36 in 9-1-1 funds on NG9-1-1 related to implementation of regional ESInets.  <u>Municipal ECDs:</u> \$2,216,265.65.	

<b>3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.</b>				
Type of ESInet	Yes	No	If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs	If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

			Operating on the ESInet	Yes	No
a. A single, state-wide ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Regional ESInets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	[If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Alamo Area Council of Governments			8 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Ark-Tex Council of Governments			13 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Brazos Valley Council of Governments			7 PSAPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Central Texas Council of Governments	9 PSAPs		
Name of Regional ESInet: Coastal Bend Council of Governments	18 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Concho Valley Council of Governments	14 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Deep East Texas Council of Governments	15 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: East Texas Council of Governments	18 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission	9 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Heart of Texas Council of Governments	7 PSAPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council	18 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Name of Regional ESInet: Middle Rio Grande Development Council	12 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: North Central Texas Council of Governments	44 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Panhandle Regional Planning Commission	23 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission	11 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Rio Grande Council of Governments	4 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: South East Texas Regional Planning Commission	13 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: South Plains Association of Governments	12 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:	6 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

South Texas Development Council			
Name of Regional ESInet: Texoma Council of Governments	6 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: West Central Texas Council of Governments	18 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Denco Area 9-1-1 District (statutory ECD)	11 PSAPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2015.**

<p><u>State 9-1-1 Program:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the calendar year of 2015, CSEC had 21 of 22 regional planning commissions completing various stages of their ESInet. Some entities were ordering equipment, while others were receiving, installing, and testing.</li> </ul> <p><u>772 ECDs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No projects reported.</li> </ul> <p><u>Municipal ECDs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchased Next Gen capable equipment.</li> <li>• Consolidated dispatch center between cities of Addison, Farmers Branch, Coppell and Carrollton, TX</li> <li>• Installed IP enabled CPE with live redundancy at alternate site.</li> <li>• Established contract with Intrado/West for Text-to-911 and to upgrade circuits to TIs.</li> <li>• The City of Dallas has hired a consultant to perform an assessment of the City's 911 call center system (hardware and software), develop specifications and provide implementation management for a new 911 NG911 call center technology solution (hardware and software).</li> </ul>
--



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

--

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?	137
Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?	87

**J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	\$586,478.61

Question	Total PSAPs	



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

<b>2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?</b>	64	
--	----	--

Question	Yes	No	Unknown
<b>3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?<sup>30</sup></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

- Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (e.g., Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**

For the state 9-1-1 program, both CSEC and its RPC stakeholders are required to submit 9-1-1 strategic plans: CSEC to the Governor and Texas Legislative Budget Board for 9-1-1 service within the state 9-1-1 program; and the RPCs to CSEC, approval of which as a prerequisite to being awarded grants of appropriated 9-1-1 fees and equalization surcharge (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.055(e) and 771.055(a)-(c), respectively).

CSEC Statewide 9-1-1 Strategic Plan

For each fiscal biennium, CSEC’s prepares a strategic plan for statewide 9-1-1 service for the following five state fiscal years using “using information from the strategic information contained in the regional plans and provided by emergency communication districts and home-rule municipalities that operate 9-1-1 systems independent of the state system.” The plan must:

<sup>30</sup> A majority, but not all, of Texas’ 75 9-1-1 Entities adhere to NIST Cybersecurity Framework.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

- (1) include a survey of the current performance, efficiency, and degree of implementation of emergency communications services throughout the whole state;
- (2) provide an assessment of the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives of the previous strategic plan and a summary of the total expenditures for emergency communications services in this state;
- (3) provide a strategic direction for emergency communications services in this state;
- (4) establish goals and objectives relating to emergency communications in this state;
- (5) provide long-range policy guidelines for emergency communications in this state;
- (6) identify major issues relating to improving emergency communications in this state;
- (7) identify priorities for this state's emergency communications system; and
- (8) detail the financial performance of each regional planning commission in implementing emergency communications service including an accounting of administrative expenses. ([Texas \(CSEC\) Strategic Plan for Statewide 9-1-1 Service \(FY 2015-2019\) \(August 2014\)](#)); a copy of which is provided electronically with Texas' response.

RPC Strategic Planning

Per Health and Safety Code § 771.055:

- (a) Each regional planning commission shall develop a regional plan for the establishment and operation of 9-1-1 service throughout the region that the regional planning commission serves. The 9-1-1 service must meet the standards established by the commission.
- (b) A regional plan must describe how the 9-1-1 service is to be administered. The 9-1-1 service may be administered by an emergency communication district, municipality, or county, by a combination formed by interlocal contract, or by other appropriate means as determined by the regional planning commission. In a region in which one or more emergency communication districts exist, a preference shall be given to administration by those districts and expansion of the area served by those districts.
- (c) A regional plan must be updated at least once every state fiscal biennium and must include:
  - (1) a description of how money allocated to the region under this chapter is to be allocated in the region;
  - (2) projected financial operating information for the two state fiscal years following the submission of the plan; and
  - (3) strategic planning information for the five state fiscal years following submission of the plan.

Statutory 772 ECDs

As noted earlier the director of a statutory 772 ECD is required to, as soon as practicable after the end of each ECD fiscal year, prepare and present to the board and to all participating public agencies in writing a sworn statement of all money received by the ECD and how the money was disbursed or otherwise disposed of during the preceding fiscal year, and the report must show in detail the operations of the district for the period covered by the report. In addition, the board of managers of a statutory ECD shall



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

perform an annual independent financial audit. By way of example, links are provided below to two documents from a statutory ECD.

<http://www.denco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/FY2015AnnualReport.pdf>.

<http://www.denco.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/FY2015Audit.pdf>.

Municipal ECDs

As noted earlier local home-rule cities and county governments do annual plans and budgets that are approved by the respective elected officials. This allows mission and objectives to be considered at that time with opportunity for constituent input. By way of example, a link is provided below for one municipal ECD.

<https://www.plano.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10064>

**PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS**

**Mission**

Provide professional, courteous, and timely assistance to the citizens and emergency responders of the City of Plano. 2014-15

**Objectives**

- Continue to maintain staffing levels at 90% or higher
- Continue to answer all 9-1-1 calls within 10-seconds 90% of time
- Continue Quality Assurance review of at least 15% on medical and 200 per month of non-medical calls
- Maintain accredited status through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) Further department presence through the use of Social Media
- Work with Plano Fire-Rescue to continually strive to maintain National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) call processing standards Continue to work towards P33
- Certification for Training standards through the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO) Perform self-assessment and achieve additional accreditation for training academy through (CALEA)
- Implement new protocol system for all three call-taking/dispatch disciplines (Fire, EMS, Police)
- Continue implementation of the Station Alerting
- Implement the automated alarm interface.